

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

William H. Canty,)	C.A. No. 4:09-45-TLW-TER
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	ORDER
)	
MSE Branded Foods, and Andy Nichols,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

The *pro se* plaintiff filed this employment discrimination action asserting claims of discrimination on the basis of race and sex in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000(e) et seq. (Doc. # 1). This matter is now before the undersigned for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.). (Doc. # 42). In his Report, Magistrate Judge Rogers recommends that plaintiff’s motion to dismiss be granted and that this case be dismissed with prejudice. No objections to the Report have been filed.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. No objections have been filed to the Report. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

A review of the record indicates that the Report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. The Court accepts the Report. The Court notes that on April 10, 2009, plaintiff, who is proceeding pro se, filed a one page document captioned, "Dismissal," which simply stated, "I would like to dismiss my case."

For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED** (Doc. # 27), and plaintiff's motion to dismiss (Doc. # 23) is **GRANTED** and this case is **DISMISSED** with prejudice. Again, the Court notes that this dismissal is as a result of plaintiff's own motion to dismiss his case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten
TERRY L. WOOTEN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

February 8, 2010
Florence, South Carolina